<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-20. The Abstract

has been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

<u>CLAIM REJECTIONS</u>

<u>35 U.S.C. §102</u>

Claims 1-3 and 7-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated

by Dunsmuir et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,638,522 (hereinafter, Dunsmuir). The rejection

to Claims 1-3 and 7-19 is traversed for the reasons discussed below. It is

respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3 and 7-19 are neither taught nor suggested

by Dunsmuir.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art
reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed
invention, arranged as in the claim (Lindemann Maschinefabrik
GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed.
Cir. 1984)).

Because Dunsmuir fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 1, arranged

as in Claim 1, the rejection to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) cannot be

maintained.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

indexing a table with said event type and a screen
capability flag to obtain said display attribute.

Claim 1 recites that a table is indexed with an event type and <u>a screen capability</u>

<u>flag</u> to obtain a display attribute. Thus, the screen capability flag, along with the

event type, is used to obtain a display attribute. Therefore, the display attribute that is produced by indexing the table depends, in part, on the screen capability flag.

Dunsmuir fails to teach or suggest, "a table is indexed with an event type and a screen capability flag to obtain a display attribute," as claimed. In stark contrast, Dunsmuir teaches a system that outputs control signals to control a toy train. Dunsmuir's system may comprise a graphical user interface (GUI) that contains events, conditions, and control actions that are to be taken (Abstract). Specific symbols in the schedule manager GUI may define an action to be taken (e.g., a control signal is output by the computer) in response to the occurrence of an event.

However, Dunsmuir does not teach or suggest indexing a table with a screen capability flag, as claimed. The claimed screen capability flag defines the display capability that a display screen possesses. However, Dunsmuir is not concerned with the display capability of a display screen. This is because Dunsmuir is concerned with outputting control signals to control a model train. Dunsmuir's schedule manager GUI may be capable of defining a control signal based on events and conditions. However, the schedule manager GUI is not constructed to allow it to be indexed based on a display capability, as claimed. Thus, Dunsmuir fails to teach or suggest, "a table is indexed with an event type and a screen capability flag to obtain a display attribute," as claimed.

Claim 1 further recites, in part:

> wherein said table is located externally of said application
> program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said
> display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to
> each of said event types.

Claim 1 further recites a limitation that the table has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of the event types. Dunsmuir may disclose a schedule manager table (see e.g., Fig. 11). However, the schedule manager table does not have display attribute lists, as claimed. The schedule manager table may comprise a column for events (292a), columns for conditions (292b and 292c), and columns for control actions (292d, 292e, 292f).

However, Claim 1 recites that the claimed display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each event type. At an minimum, what is not taught or suggested in the schedule manager table of Dunsmuir is a display attribute list having a display attribute corresponding to each event type. For example, the schedule manager table does not contain information (e.g., a list) that defines what color should be displayed based on that event. Thus, Dunsmuir fails to teach or suggest, "a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of said event types." as claimed.

Claim 1 still further recites, in part:

> an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call including an event type corresponding to said event object.

Thus, Claim 1 recites that an application program makes a call to request a display attribute. Dunsmuir fails to teach or suggest, "an application program ... making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen," as claimed. The rejection refers col. 18, lines 11-40 and col. 19, lines 36-42 with respect to the claimed limitation of "requesting a display attribute." However, Dunsmuir fails to teach or suggest requesting a display attribute in these cited passages. The passage at col. 18 discloses a schedule manager table that defines how the model train is to be controlled. However, this passage does not teach or suggest, "an application program ... making a call to request a display attribute," as claimed. The passage at col. 19, lines 36-42 may disclose the use of color may to indicate status. However, this passage does not disclose or suggest "an application program ... making a call to request a display attribute," as claimed. For example, the use of color to indicate status is entirely consistent with the program making the decision on which color to use itself.

For the foregoing reasons, Dunsmuir fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 12

Claim 12 recites, in part:

> a) an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call including an event type corresponding to said event object;
>
> b) in response to said request, indexing a table with said event type and a screen capability flag to obtain said display attribute, wherein said table is located externally of said application program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of said event types

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Claim 12 is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Therefore, allowance of Claim 12 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 15

Claim 15 recites, in part:

> a) an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call including an event type corresponding to said event object;
>
> b) in response to said request, indexing a table with said event type and a screen capability flag to obtain said display attribute, wherein said table is located externally of said application program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of said event types

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Claim 15 is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Therefore, allowance of Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-14, and 16-19 depend from Claims 1, 12, and 15, which are believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-14, and 16-19 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)
CLAIMS 4-6

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunsmuir in view of Dev et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,293 B1 (hereinafter, Dev). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, "indexing a table with said event type and a screen capability flag to obtain said display attribute" is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Dev fails to remedy this deficiency in Dunsmuir. Thus, the combination of Dunsmuir and Dev fail to teach or suggest the limitation of, "indexing a table with said event type and a screen capability flag to obtain said display attribute," as claimed.

Further, for the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, "wherein said table is located externally of said application program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute

corresponding to each of said event types" is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Dev fails to remedy this deficiency in Dunsmuir. Thus, the combination of Dunsmuir and Dev fail to teach or suggest the limitation of, "wherein said table is located externally of said application program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of said event types" as claimed.

Further still, for the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, "an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call including an event type corresponding to said event object" is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Dev fails to remedy this deficiency in Dunsmuir. Thus, the combination of Dunsmuir and Dev fail to teach or suggest the limitation of, "an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call including an event type corresponding to said event object" as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, the combination of Dunsmuir and Dev, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. As Claims 4-6 depend from Claim 1, Dunsmuir and Dev fail to teach or suggest nay of Claims 4-6.

CLAIM 20

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunsmuir in view of Blair et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,111,572 (hereinafter, Blair). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 15, "indexing a table with said event type and a screen capability flag to obtain said display attribute" is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Blair fails to remedy this deficiency in Dunsmuir. Thus, the combination of Dunsmuir and Blair fail to teach or suggest the limitation of, "indexing a table with said event type and a screen capability flag to obtain said display attribute," as claimed.

Further, for the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 15, "wherein said table is located externally of said application program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of said event types" is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Blair fails to remedy this deficiency in Dunsmuir. Thus, the combination of Dunsmuir and Blair fail to teach or suggest the limitation of, "wherein said table is located externally of said application program and has a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute corresponding to each of said event types" as claimed.

Further still, for the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 15, "an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call

including an event type corresponding to said event object" is neither taught nor suggested by Dunsmuir. Blair fails to remedy this deficiency in Dunsmuir. Thus, the combination of Dunsmuir and Blair fail to teach or suggest the limitation of, "an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an event object to be displayed on a display screen, said call including an event type corresponding to said event object" as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, the combination of Dunsmuir and Blair fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 15. As Claim 20 depends from Claim 15, Dunsmuir and Blair fail to teach or suggest Claim 20.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: _10/30___, 2003

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Registration No. 43,009

Address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone:

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile